

*Appropriations
Committee 1956*

STATEMENT BY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

a. The Congress, in Title IV of the Military Construction Act of 1955, (69 Stat. 349) authorized \$46,000,000 for the construction of a CIA Headquarters building, together with \$8,500,000 for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Virginia, if the Agency finally selected a portion of the Government-owned Bureau of Public Roads property as the building site.

b. The Congress initially appropriated (Chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956; 69 Stat. 453) \$5,500,000, with the understanding that \$3,000,000 of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation, and \$2,500,000 for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the Parkway.

MORI/CDF

c. I am here today to request the appropriation of the balance of the authorized funds - \$49,000,000 - of which \$43,000,000 is for the building and \$6,000,000 for the extension of the Parkway.

2. SITE

a. When the Congress suggested last year that we study carefully the location of our proposed headquarters building, we engaged Clarke and Rapuano, a firm of Consulting Engineers and Landscape Architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose.

b. Their study resulted in a strong recommendation of a portion of the Federally-owned property presently occupied by the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Virginia.

c. Located on a 125-acre tract, part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for

safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting those operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security considerations. This site is bordered along the Potomac by Parkway land, a belt 750 to 1,000 feet wide, under the control of the National Parks Service, affording an added measure of protection. The isolation, topography and heavy forestation of the site provide additional security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush-hour traffic conditions, and it permits access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

d. The Agency approved the recommendation of Clarke and Rapuano and, as required by law, proposed it for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Regional Planning Council (5 - 3) and the National Capital Planning

Commission (7 -5) approved the Langley site on 5 December 1955 and 3 February 1956, respectively.

e. In addition, the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Arlington and Fairfax County Boards and the Falls Church City Council have all endorsed this location.

f. With your permission, I shall submit for the record the reports of the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the Fairfax County Planning Commission, and a Brief of the primary factors contained in the Clarke and Rapuano report.

g. While there has been some persistent opposition by a small minority of local residents, the large majority favor CIA at Langley. This was best indicated in a poll conducted by Congressman Broyhill, which showed that 73.3% of Fairfax County voters favor this location with only 17.9% opposed and 8.8% having no opinion. In the Dranesville District, in which the site is located, the percentage in favor is even higher.

h. In approving the Langley site, the National Capital Planning Commission indicated that it and the Regional Planning Council believed that certain long-planned highway improvements would need to be programmed at an earlier date.

i. We believe that the projected immediate extension of the Parkway, and the widening of a portion of Route 123 to which the State of Virginia is committed, will provide adequate access to the Langley site without overburdening other existing facilities.

j. The key to access to the Langley site is the ability to move traffic across the river. A study of Potomac River crossings demonstrates that adequate capacity exists for CIA traffic to and from Langley, especially since at the rush hours Agency traffic will be moving counter to the general flow. Location of the Agency at Langley will, in fact, remove an estimated 1,000 cars from the dominant flow of rush-hour traffic across the Potomac.

k. A study of the locations of the residences of Agency employees demonstrates that those living east of the Potomac can use a variety of river crossings in commuting to and from the Langley site, and that the 31% living in Virginia will not have to cross the river at all. We are not, as some have alleged, preparing to throw three or four thousand cars across the Chain Bridge.

3. COSTS

a. The Public Buildings Service, in coordination with this Agency, has negotiated an architect-engineer contract with the firm of Harrison and Abramovitz. The architects have prepared a preliminary site plan and schematic drawings of the proposed Headquarters installation, together with supporting architectural and engineering information, on the basis of which the Public Buildings Service has prepared its cost analysis and estimate.

b. In considering the nature of the installation, a complete survey was made by the architects of the special requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency. Harrison and Abramovitz has recommended a building consisting of block-type wings as most satisfactorily meeting all the special and unusual requirements of the Agency. The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security considerations primarily in mind. The block-type wings are readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable.

c. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this building is not in any sense lavish. Our architects assure us that it is much more severe than typical office buildings being constructed for private clients, and it is my own belief that its austerity will far exceed that of any modern Government office building.

d. Our plans are based on average net office space of approximately 98.5 square feet per person, in comparison to a Government-wide average of 112 square feet in the Washington Metropolitan area.

e. Even so, the Public Buildings Service and our architects believe it impossible to construct, within the \$46,000,000 authorized, a building which will accommodate all of our personnel. I would like to review briefly the history of our cost estimates.

1. PBS's original estimate (March 1955) was \$50,840,000.
2. In our hearings at the Bureau of the Budget (April 1955) this was rounded off to \$50,000,000.
3. The Congress reduced our authorization to \$46,000,000.
4. Construction costs have risen 5.72% during the past twelve months. Present estimates are also slightly higher because they are based on specific plans for a specific building on a specific site, rather than being in the abstract.

5. The present estimate by PBS and our architects (May 1956) for an austere building to house the entire Agency is \$55,980,000.

f. While it is highly desirable to have all of our people in one building, we can operate with the more sensitive elements in one building and less sensitive operations elsewhere. With the block-type wing building we have in mind, we could add another wing later if necessary, without excessive increased costs.

g. The block model is of a \$56,000,000 building which would house the entire Agency. The shaded portions are those which would have to be omitted in a \$46,000,000 building.

h. A \$46,000,000 building would provide space for all of our employees who are now housed in temporary buildings, thus permitting the evacuation of that space so that demolition will be possible in accordance with Government plans for urban renewal in the District of Columbia, and as required by the Act authorizing the building.

i. I would like to emphasize that \$56,000,000 is a current realistic estimate of the cost of providing one installation for all of our activities, and that it in no way reflects any change in our original requirements as we presented them to the Congress last year.

j. I am seeking a building which the employees of CIA will find pleasant to work in and conducive to maximum production. I am not seeking luxury. Clean, well-lighted offices; air-conditioning; partitioning adequate to our security needs; functional building and office arrangement which facilitates close teamwork and minimizes time lost in "commuting" from one building to another; a location convenient to present residences; adequate parking space in lieu of the parking situation at our present location - these I believe are reasonable goals.

4. SAVINGS

a. With a \$46,000,000 building it would be necessary to

retain eleven permanent-type buildings we now occupy. With this arrangement, we estimate an annual saving in operating cost of approximately \$1,500,000.

b. Consolidating all of our activities in a single building as originally planned (which would now cost \$56,000,000) would result in annual savings of more than \$3,000,000.

c. There will in addition, in either case, be increased efficiency in the processing of intelligence information not readily measurable in monetary terms.

5. REQUEST

a. I would like at this time to request that the Congress appropriate \$49,000,000, constituting the balance of the funds presently authorized, in order that the construction may proceed without delay or interruption.

b. I hope you will concur in my view that it would be false economy not to construct a building adequate to house all of our

people. The basic facilities such as heating, air-conditioning, elevators, etc., are being designed to service a building which would accommodate all of our employees. In January when our final plans will be nearing completion, if, in the judgment of the Congress, it seems wise to request that our enabling legislation be amended in order to provide for a building costing approximately \$56,000,000, I would propose to make such a request along with a request for the necessary appropriation (approximately \$10,000,000) with which to carry out the construction.